



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,209	12/13/2001	Kevin S. Dibble	020533.0437	1173

7590 05/31/2005

Douglas M. Kubehl  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

JAMAL, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/017,209

Applicant(s)

DIBBLE ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander Jamal

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Based upon the submitted amendment (3-31-2005), the examiner notes that claims 1,14,26-29 have been amended.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-8,11-21,24-29**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson (6546098), and further in view of Bushue et al. (5539805) and further in view of Cohn et al. (6714644).

As per **claim 1**, Henderson discloses a NID with interfaces capable of receiving multiple calls over a subscriber line (Fig. 2) and connecting them to multiple telephone lines at the customer premise (Col 12 line 60 to Col 13 line 38). The NID may provide ring voltages to the lines (Col 2 line 64 to Col 3 line 3). However, Henderson does not specify that the processor (Col 3 lines 55-67) is operable to generate the ringing signals

on the phone lines in a manner that ensures that a total load on the system is below a threshold.

Bushue teaches a NID (network interface device) that will allocate multiple ringing signals to their respective telephone lines in the event that an 'undervoltage' event occurs (Col 3 lines 5-20, Col 3 line 53 to Col 4 line 27). This ensures that the device does not exceed a determined threshold level. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement a ringing signal allocation such that a maximum load is not exceeded for the purpose of saving power in the device.

Cohn et al. teaches that in power limited systems, the act of ringing multiple phones simultaneously draws more power than can be supplied to the device (Col 1 lines 15-50). He teaches that the ring signals output to multiple lines may be staggered to ensure that the maximum instantaneous load threshold of the system is not exceeded (Col 2 line 10 to Col 3 line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application for Henderson in view of Bushue to implement the ring staggering function taught by Cohn for the purpose of maintaining the reduced power draw of the NID and providing true AC ring signals (as opposed to the AC/DC signals in Bushue) to those customers in an under-voltage situation that do not always require simultaneous signaling.

As per **claim 14**, claim rejected as a method performed by the device in the rejection of claim 1.

As per **claims 26-29**, claims rejected for the same reasons as the rejection of claim 1. The device inherently comprises software for the purpose of controlling the processor.

As per **claim 6,19**, Bushue discloses that the device is operable to measure the load of any telephone line (sensed by the detection circuit while any line is being rung) (Col 3 lines 50-67).

As per **claim 7,20**, Henderson discloses that the system may receive class of service information received during incoming calls (Col 8 lines 45-60).

As per **claim 8,21**, Henderson discloses that the user may communicate with voice server 500 (Fig. 5) via the use of any standard telephone signaling protocol (this would include DTMF) (Col 10 lines 5-30). Via this interface (Col 11 lines 20-30) (Col 12 line 39 to Col 13 line 4) the user may allocate any telephone number (or incoming call) to any subscriber line in the system.

As per **claims 11,24**, Henderson discloses an interface to communicate with a digital device (enhanced telephone).

As per **claim 12**, Henderson discloses that the NID comprises a DSL line interface (from the CO), a subscriber telephone interface (SLIC) (Fig. 6), a CODEC, a DSP and a wireless interface (Fig. 9).

Art Unit: 2643

As per **claims 13,25**, Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to implement telephone ringing signals with a 2 seconds on, 4 seconds off cadence (BUSHUE: Col 1 lines 40-55).

As per **claims 2,3,15,16**, claims rejected for same reasons as claim 29.

As per **claims 4,5,17,18**, claims rejected for same reasons as claim 29. Bushue discloses that the ringing signals are only allocated in the situation when the total system load exceeds a threshold (Col 4 lines 20-26).

4. **Claims 9,22** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson (6546098), Bushue et al. (5539805) and Cohn et al. (6714644), as applied to claims 1,14, and further in view of Boudreaux Jr. et al. (6584197).

As per **claims 9,22**, Henderson and Bushue disclose applicant's claims 1,14, however, they do not disclose that the NID comprises a local power supply to supply power to the unit, and a line power supply to supply the unit if the local power supply fails.

Boudreaux discloses a NID that is supplied with local power and in case the local power fails, line power may be utilized (Col 13 claim 4). If the local power fails, the line power will assure that the telephone lines are still active. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement a local power source in the NID for the advantage of increased reliability (multiple power sources) in the event of a power supply failure.

Art Unit: 2643

5. **Claims 10,23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson (6546098) and Bushue et al. (5539805) and Cohn et al. (6714644), as applied to claims 1,14, and further in view of Wilkes, Jr. et al. (6757382).

As per **claims 10,23**, Henderson and Bushue disclose applicant's claims 1,14, however, they do not disclose that the NID may switch the line from the CO to the NID or to a Splitter that separates the DC bias on the CO line from the ringing.

Wilkes discloses a NID with a POTS bypass path (lifeline) in the event that the DSL line from the CO is not functioning correctly (Col 2 lines 20-67, Fig. 2). When the bypass is enabled (Col 3 lines 4-27), the subscriber line is connected directly to the CO linecard, which is operable as a splitter that is operable to deliver ringing to the telephone line (during bypass mode) and deliver line power to the NID (during normal mode). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement a bypass from the subscriber line to the splitter linecard in the CO for the advantage of increased reliability in the event of an error in the DSL connection between the CO and the NID.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 2-5,15-18,29** filed 3-31-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments concerning the combination of the voltage threshold detection of Bushue being combined with the ring staggering function of Cohn (remarks pages 11-13), examiner contends there is proper motivation to combine the

functionalities. Cohn discloses that the ring staggering (delaying the ring signals) may occur in the event that a 'ring scheduler' determines whether there are sufficient resources available (COHN: Col 7 lines 34-48). However, Cohn does not specify the details of the detection. Bushue discloses a specific and accurate form of resource detection by means of a total load threshold. Cohn provides an improvement over Bushue in which the ringing signals are able to maintain their original AC waveforms instead of being dropped to DC. Even though the DC ring signals are only maintained for 100msec periods each time, examiner contends that maintaining the waveforms in the AC format will lessen the chance of transient spikes in switching from an AC signal level to a DC signal level. Additionally, the subscriber telephone set may comprise a digital stage before the ringing device that may be expecting a specific range of AC signal before triggering the ringing mechanism of the phone. In these cases Cohn provides clear motivation to implement the ring staggering function in Bushue.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1,6-8,11-14,19-21,24-28** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**



Art Unit: 2643

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9315 for After Final communications.

AJ  
May 24, 2005

  
CURTIS KUNTZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600